



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

## Journal Pre-proof

Prior COVID-19 significantly reduces the risk of subsequent infection, but reinfections are seen after eight months

Dr. Aodhán Seán Breathnach M.D. , Peter Andrew Riley M.D. ,  
Meaghan Patricia Cotter F.R.C.Path. ,  
Angela Cara Houston F.R.C.Path. ,  
Maximillian Shahin Habibi Ph.D. , Timothy David Planche M.D.

PII: S0163-4453(21)00010-4  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.01.005>  
Reference: YJINF 4991



To appear in: *Journal of Infection*

Accepted date: 9 January 2021

Please cite this article as: Dr. Aodhán Seán Breathnach M.D. , Peter Andrew Riley M.D. , Meaghan Patricia Cotter F.R.C.Path. , Angela Cara Houston F.R.C.Path. , Maximillian Shahin Habibi Ph.D. , Timothy David Planche M.D. , Prior COVID-19 significantly reduces the risk of subsequent infection, but reinfections are seen after eight months, *Journal of Infection* (2021), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.01.005>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2021 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of The British Infection Association.

**Prior COVID-19 significantly reduces the risk of subsequent infection, but reinfections are seen after eight months**

Running Title: COVID-19 duration of immunity and reinfection

**Authors**

Aodhán Seán Breathnach M.D. <sup>(1,2)</sup>

Peter Andrew Riley M.D. <sup>(1,2)</sup>

Meaghan Patricia Cotter F.R.C.Path. <sup>(1)</sup>

Angela Cara Houston F.R.C.Path. <sup>(1)</sup>

Maximillian Shahin Habibi Ph.D. <sup>(1)</sup>

Timothy David Planche M.D. <sup>(1,2)</sup>

(1) Department of Infection,  
St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,  
London

(2) Institute of Infection and Immunity  
St George's University of London

**Corresponding author:**

Dr Aodhán Breathnach

Department of Infection

St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,  
London SW17 0QT

Telephone 00 44 20 8725 5735

Email [aodhan.breathnach@stgeorges.nhs.uk](mailto:aodhan.breathnach@stgeorges.nhs.uk)

As the second wave of the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic takes hold, there is still much that is not certain, in particular the degree and duration of protective immunity following infection in the first wave. Hanrath and colleagues<sup>1</sup> have shown that there were no reinfections identified in a cohort of 1,038 previously infected healthcare workers followed for approximately seven months after the first wave of the Pandemic. A study of 12,000 healthcare workers in the UK similarly showed evidence for protective immunity for up to 31 weeks after infection, although both studies ended before December 2020, when the number of cases in the UK increased significantly<sup>2</sup>. Experience with other human coronaviruses suggests that reinfections might be expected even with the same strain within a few months, but the other hand, evidence from SARS suggests that immunity can persist for much longer<sup>3</sup>. There is good evidence that cellular and humoral markers of immunity persist for several months following SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>4</sup>, but there have been a limited number of concerning reports of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection<sup>5</sup>.

This is an important question, with significant implications for COVID-19 control. The lack of evidence for protective immunity means that public health authorities have been cautious about relaxing quarantine guidelines for patients and healthcare workers who have previously had COVID-19. For example, UK currently does not differentiate between recovered patients and those who have never had the infection<sup>6</sup>, with legally enforceable quarantine of all exposed contacts, irrespective of their immune status. US guidance is more pragmatic and exempts recovered patients from quarantine if subsequently exposed, but only if this is within three months of the first illness<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, the emergence of new genetic variants of SARS-CoV-2 has raised concerns that immunity may be strain-specific, although there is as yet no evidence for this<sup>8</sup>.

To address this question, we examined results of SARS-CoV-2 PCR and antibody tests in our south-west London laboratory, which serves four hospitals and a population of 1.3 million. We determined who had evidence of COVID-19 in the first wave of infections in the UK (February to July 2020, with a peak in early April), as shown either by a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR or a positive antibody test, and determined their risk of having a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR assay in the first five months of the second wave (August to December 2020), compared with patients who had a previous negative PCR or antibody test. Cases where the second positive result was  $\leq 90$  days after the first were excluded. Antibody samples were tested on either the Roche Elecsys or the Abbot Architect according to manufacturers guidelines. PCR assays were performed on the Roche 6800 or the Altona Diagnostics RealStar. The samples included a significant proportion from healthcare workers, who were offered testing for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in June 2020.

The results are shown in the tables. We identified 66,001 patients who had a PCR and/or serological SARS-CoV-2 assay before the end of July, of whom 60% were female, with an average age of 50 years. It was not recorded which samples were from healthcare workers. 10,727 patients had evidence of COVID-19 in the first wave. Of these, eight had a positive PCR assay between 1<sup>st</sup> August and 30<sup>th</sup> December 2020, more than 90 days after their previous positive assay (0.07%). All eight reinfections were in female patients, and one (aged 71) was admitted to hospital. Four additional patients who had a positive PCR result in August were excluded from analysis because this occurred within 90 days of their last positive result in the first wave (range 7 to 31 days). Of 55,274 patients with no laboratory evidence of COVID-19 in the first wave, 713 subsequently had SARS-CoV-2 detected in the second wave (1.29%). This implies a relative risk of 0.0578 of COVID-19 in the second wave among those who had evidence of infection in the first wave (95% confidence intervals 0.0288 to 0.1160). Of note, there were no reinfections in the first seven months after the peak of the first wave; all eight patients with likely reinfections were diagnosed in December, the last month of the study period; reinfections accounted for 1.69% of all infections in that month.

These results confirm other recent studies showing that patients who had COVID-19 in the first wave of infections have a significantly lower risk of a later positive PCR test<sup>1,2</sup>. However, the emergence of a small number of reinfections in December, eight months after the first wave peak, is a cause for concern, suggesting that immunity may begin to wane in some patients around this time. Nonetheless, even with the limited number of reinfections, prior infection still confers a protective effect of 94% over the time of the study. This is equivalent to or better than the protection reported in recent vaccine studies<sup>9,10</sup>. The requirement to isolate (sometimes repeatedly) may adversely affect education, employment and mental health. In healthcare settings, unnecessary isolation may lead to staff shortages and clinical risk as a result. Data, as presented by Hanrath and colleagues<sup>1</sup> and as shown by this study, should help inform public health infection prevention and control strategy to enable safe continued running of society.

Further studies and longer surveillance are needed to confirm the duration of protection following previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, as well as the likelihood of subclinical infection and the impact of the evolution of new variants of the virus. In addition, as various national COVID-19 vaccination programmes get underway, it is important to remember that patients with prior SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were excluded from some of the vaccine studies<sup>9,10</sup>, and the efficacy of the vaccines on patients with prior immunity is unknown, and should perhaps be studied further.

**References:**

- 1 Hanrath AT *et al.* Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection is associated with protection against symptomatic reinfection. *Journal of Infection* (2020 Dec 23), doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.12.023>
  
- 2 Lumley SF *et al.* Antibody Status and Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care Workers. *N Engl J Med.* (2020 Dec 23), doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034545. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33369366.
  
- 3 Sariol A, Perlman S. Lessons for COVID-19 Immunity from Other Coronavirus Infections. *Immunity.* 2020 Aug 18;53(2):248-263. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2020.07.005. Epub 2020 Jul 14. PMID: 32717182; PMCID: PMC7359787.
  
- 4 Tan Y, *et al.* Durability of neutralizing antibodies and T-cell response post SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Front Med* 2020 Sep 16. [Epub ahead of print] doi: 10.1007/s11684-020-0822-5
  
- 5 Tillett RL *et al.* Genomic evidence for reinfection with SARS-CoV-2: a case study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021 Jan;21(1):52-58. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30764-7. Epub 2020 Oct 12. PMID: 33058797; PMCID: PMC7550103.
  
- 6 Public Health England. COVID-19: Management of staff and exposed patients or residents in health and social care settings. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-management-of-exposed-healthcare-workers-and-patients-in-hospital-settings>. Accessed on 4/1/2021
  
- 7 Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. When to Quarantine. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html>. Accessed on 4/1/2021.
  
- 8 Public Health England. Investigation of novel SARS-CoV-2 variant. Variant of Concern 202012?01. Technical Briefing 2. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data)

/file/948152/Technical\_Briefing\_VOC202012-2\_Briefing\_2\_FINAL.pdf.

Accessed on 4/1/2021

9 Polack FP *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Dec 31;**383**(27):2603-2615.

doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.

Epub 2020 Dec 10. PMID: 33301246; PMCID: PMC7745181.

10 Voysey M *et al.* Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet.* 2020 Dec 8:S0140-6736(20)32661-1. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32661-1. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33306989; PMCID: PMC7723445.

**Table 1: Patient numbers and demographics**

	Total	SARS-CoV-2 infection in first wave	SARS-CoV-2 PCR+ in second wave	Reinfections
Number	66001	10727	721	8
% Female	60%	60%	62%	100%
Average age	50 years	53 years	54 years	55 years



**Table 2: SARS-CoV-2 infections in the second wave of the Pandemic, in patients with and without evidence of infection in the first wave.**

		Subsequent PCR Positive, August - December (> 90 day interval)			
		Yes	No	Proportion positive in second wave	Relative Risk (95% confidence interval)
<b>Laboratory evidence of prior SARS-CoV-2</b>	Yes	8	10719	0·00075	0·0578
	No	713	54561	0·01290	(0·0288 to 0·1160)

**Funding:** This study received no external funding

**Declarations of interest:** The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest.

**Author Contributions:**

A Breathnach: study design, extracted, analysed and interpreted the data, wrote the article

P Riley: study design, contribution to writing the article

M Cotter: contribution to writing the article


A Houston: contribution to writing the article

M Habibi: support with statistical analysis, contribution to writing the article

T Planche: contributed to study design, statistical analysis, validation of the underlying data

**Ethics Committee Approval** – not required

Caption for Figure:



Graphical Abstract presenting an overview of the study, displaying numbers of patients with and without evidence of COVID-19 in the first wave of the pandemic, and the number in each category who went on to develop COVID-19 in the second wave.